



City of Tempe

SUMMARY FOR OPEN HOUSE
ZONING REWRITE

Monday, September 08, 2003
Kyrene Middle School

ATTENDANCE:

Ken/Carol Hunis	Dave Dressel
Johnnie Godfrey	Mare Schumacher
Craig/Cindy Haglin	Rick Hondorp
Ruth G. McCaw	Dave Swanson
Rosendo Portillo	Chris/Diane Christenson
Bill Butler	Anna Hicks
Robert/Virginia Sandstedt	Dino Castelli
Kirby Spittler	John Kane
Janet Anderson	Janice Stevenson
Darin Sender	David Eng
Ronald D. Cox	Hut Hutson

STAFF/CONSULTANT ATTENDING:

Roger Millar, OTAK	Fred Brittingham
Ryan Levesque	Chris Messer
Melanie Hobden	Steve Venker

1. INTRODUCTION

- A powerpoint overview of the Zoning Rewrite was presented to the group.
- A total of 38 people in attendance including six staff.

2. COMMENTS

- I am very concerned that Tempe continues to require that state statutory requirements (no self-induced hardships etc.) be enforced before allowing any variances to the new code.
- I am concerned about losing the open space by changing the setbacks in residential areas. I'm hoping that sticking "out buildings" on yards so close to lot lines will affect neighbors personal space.
- In view of our present+ future water resources, I feel it is imperative to restrict types of foliage to xeriscape landscaping as Tucson does. Currently, how many Aleppo pines are dead in Tempe?
- Density of housing units should be coordinated with access to arterial streets, bearing in mind that even a one-bedroom apartment may generate 2 or more vehicles+ interesting that roosters are prohibited but barking dogs are allowed + wandering cats.
- The large quantity of shopping centers are being abandoned by their "anchor" businesses. Can code be revised to prevent the over population of specific businesses-grocers, drug stores, etc?
- Perception of loss or open space for single-family development. (can lead to outside ?(sic) taking over.
- Separation between houses is reduced. Old neighborhoods at this time still provide that.

- Q-Draft "zoning code" does support 2020 and currently being compared to consistency with 2030.
- Q-New code does not require greater amount of landscaping.
- Are we proposing changes to specific area plan standards+ process?
- Eliminate 150 ft. area protested. Have limitation and protest % the same.
- Currently "draft" has no affect on CC&R's.
- Because proposed change is eliminating something (such as setback) if it is existing legally, then it is grandfathered (sic).
- During the meeting/ gathering, a count from the audience was taken on how many residents present had a chance to review the zoning draft: more than half had not. (*Four people have read it*)
- A major concern that was provided was preserving the existing living in Tempe (such as horse property) code should not effect this.
- Residential set back may not affect homeowners but it may affect business owners.
- Concern for affect ties on adjacent property. Right now document does not address this.
- In certain districts/ neighborhoods there should be a meeting/ public hearing to discuss lot ties.
- Is the real reason city is concerned about loosing residents because they want a larger home or lack of expansion? And has there been a poll taken to justify this? Yes
- Meeting member (Fred) mentioned that changes are happening and being proposed because Tempe is trying to keep or bring property value up and for greater growth to residents.
- Home occupation summarized "it how allows employees" (sic).
- Pedestrian overlays district versus others is no longer in ordinance and is being addressed separately.